



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/551,899	04/19/2000	Harri Rajala	0544MH-34056(RM 143)	3555

7590 10/23/2002
Terry J. Stalford
Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue
Suite 600
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

PILLAI, NAMITHA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/551,899

Applicant(s)

RAJALA ET AL.

Examiner

Namitha Pillai

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 April 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 9.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed September 6, 2001 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the dates are missing for the publications. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1).

Oath/Declaration

2. The oath or declaration is defective. The oath filed on September 26, 2000 fails to properly make use of the 35 U.S.C 120. A new executed oath or declaration identifying the correct application number in reference to the application whose benefits are claimed in this application is required. The executed oath received on September 26, 2000 fails to properly identify applicants claim for priority.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because Figures 11, 12 and 16 are not legible.
4. The drawings are objected to because it is not clear what reference number 108 and 110 are referring to in Figure 1.
5. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 303 in Figure 5; 220,

Art Unit: 2173

220 and 224 (page 16, line 19); 333 (page 16, line 21); 402 and 404 in Figure 11; 502, 522 and 526 (page 20, line 22), 526 (page 21, line 5); 500 (page 21, line 6); 605, 607, 609 and 611 in Figure 3 (page 25, lines 11-12).

6. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show Figure 815 as described in the specification (page 30, line 1). Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d).

A proposed drawing correction, in red ink, or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Step 1(d) in claim 1, refers to the a plurality of rendering engines which will dynamically “constrict” a plurality of graphical user interfaces whereas in the specification the rendering engines are referred to as dynamically “constructing” a plurality of graphical user interfaces.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2173

8. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,330,007 B1 (Isreal et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 6,345,278 B1 (Hitchcock et al.).

Referring to claims 1 and 5, Isreal discloses a single database, which maintains a plurality of user interface metadata including components identifications and component properties (column 2, lines 38-40). Isreal also discloses a visual rule model for configuring a plurality of graphical user interface dialog pages utilizing data from the database and a plurality of dialog rules (column 1, lines 62-66 and column 2, lines 1-5). Isreal also discloses a plurality of rendering engines each adapted to respond to commands from the visual rule model (column 7, lines 14-16 and Figure 2B). Isreal also discloses a dialog manager for passing at least the metadata to the rendering engines to construct a plurality of graphical user interfaces (column 2, lines 1-2 and column 7, lines 5-16). Isreal does not disclose a transaction between a Seller and a plurality of Buyers over a distributed data processing system. Hitchcock discloses a system for communicating transaction between a Seller and a plurality of Buyers over a distributed data processing system (column 1, lines 24-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to modify Isreal's invention such that it was a distributed data processing system for communicating commercial transaction information between a Seller and a plurality of Buyers. Isreal's objectives involved creating a plurality of customized graphical user interfaces for software applications. It is possible that the distributed data processing system referred to in Hitchcock's invention could be one of the software applications referred to by Isreal.

Referring to claims 2 and 6, Hitchcock refers to a rendering engine, which can format by a hypertext mark-up language. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 2173

the time the invention is made to modify Isreal's invention such that one of the plurality of rendering engines used to generate reports was a hypertext mark-up rendering engine. With software applications that deal with Seller/Buyer commercial transaction and its reliance on the Internet, a rendering engine that can create web pages would be an obvious addition.

Referring to claim 3, 4, 7 and 8, Isreal refers to establishing a communication connection that is relatively a low bandwidth communication channel comprising an Internet connection (column 6, lines 36-44).

Referring to claim 9, Hitchcock refers to rendering customized forms using XML (column 21, lines 13-15). Hitchcock also discusses rendering forms using HTML and other programming languages (column 4, lines 23-33). Hitchcock does not disclose three rendering engines. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to modify such that Hitchcock's invention had three rendering engines. Hitchcock's invention requires a plurality of rendering engines for generating forms using XML and HTML. It is notoriously well known that there is a lot of JAVA code embedded in HTML files and thus a JAVA rendering engine would be necessary when accessing, creating and displaying information concerning transactions on the Internet. The examiner takes Official Notice of this teaching. It would have been obvious to add another engine using another language such as JAVA to Hitchcock's invention for convenience especially when concerning commercial transactions, which use HTML, files with JAVA code in it. One skilled in the art, at the time of the invention, would be motivated to implement this teaching so that HTML files with JAVA code in it can be displayed to buyers in a commercial transaction, thereby providing a display which will include more options.

Art Unit: 2173

Referring to claim 10, Isreal refers to establishing a communication connection that is relatively a low bandwidth communication channel (column 6, lines 36-44). Isreal discloses a single database, which maintains a plurality of user interface metadata including components identifications and component properties (column 2, lines 38-40). Isreal also discloses a plurality of rendering engines each adapted to respond to commands (column 7, lines 14-16 and Figure 2B). Isreal discloses a dialog manager for passing at least the metadata to the rendering engines to construct a plurality of graphical user interfaces (column 2, lines 1-2 and column 7, lines 5-16). Isreal does not disclose a transaction between a Seller and a plurality of Buyers over a distributed data processing system. Isreal also does not disclose rendering engines in reference to the programming language they are written in. Hitchcock discloses a system for communicating transaction between a Seller and a plurality of Buyers over a distributed data processing system (column 1, lines 24-25). Hitchcock refers to rendering customized forms using XML (column 21, lines 13-15). Hitchcock also discusses rendering forms using HTML and other programming languages (column 4, lines 23-33). Hitchcock passes transaction information by using a low-bandwidth communication channel to pass user information using forms in the graphical user interface which confine particular portions of metadata and the output of particular appropriate one of the rendering engines (column 5, lines 60-66). Hitchcock also receives transaction selections over a relatively low bandwidth communication channel (column 6, lines 14-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to modify Isreal's invention such that it was a distributed data processing system for communicating commercial transaction information between a Seller and a plurality of Buyers. Isreal's objectives involved created plurality of customized graphical user interfaces

for software applications. It is possible that the distributed data processing system referred to in Hitchcock's invention could be one of the software applications referred to by Isreal. It would then become obvious to include methods for passing transactions and receiving transactions between a buyer and seller when referring to a commercial transaction information system.

Referring to claim 11, Isreal refers to establishing a communication connection that is relatively a low bandwidth communication channel comprising an Internet connection (column 6, lines 36-44).

Referring to claim 12, Hitchcock refers to rendering files using HTML (column 5, lines 44-46).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach the method for displaying customized graphical user interfaces for commercial transaction information systems.

Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington D.C. 20231. If applicant desires to fax a response, (703) 746-7238 may be used for formal After Final communications, (703) 746-7239 for Official communications, or (703) 746-7240 for Non-Official or draft communications. NOTE: A Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for informal facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Namitha Pillai whose telephone number is (703) 305-7691. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116.

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.



JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Application/Control Number: 09/551,899

Page 9

Art Unit: 2173

Namitha Pillai

Assistant Examiner

Art Unit 2173

October 21, 2002